DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 716 JC 000 651

TITLE	Trident Technical College Summary of Assessment Results for 1999-2000.
INSTITUTION	Trident Technical Coll., Charleston, SC.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	9p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Institutional Evaluation; Outcomes of Education; Program Improvement; *School Effectiveness; *Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This report for South Carolina's Trident Technical College (TTC) includes the following Institutional Effectiveness components: majors or concentrations, academic advising, two-year to four-year transfer, and library resources and services. Across the programs, the most common effectiveness indicators include job placement rates, number of graduates, employer satisfaction, graduate satisfaction, student success in specified course, student satisfaction with courses and instructors, and fall enrollment. Program managers designed improvement plans for those indicators where benchmarks were not met. Describes these strategies by indicator. Spring 1999 brought full implementation of the academic advising process. The first assessment of the new process revealed some weaknesses such as advisor availability and lower than expected numbers of students registered by their advisor for fall 1999. Outlines an improvement plan for the academic advising process. TTC gauges transfer activity and performance of its students by comparing: size of transfer cohorts across time; number and percent of students transferring to senior colleges; each cohort's average GPA; and the senior institution's rejection rates of TTC applicants. Outcomes of the 1999-2000 learning resource assessment met or exceeded expected levels of performance for 15 of 21 indicators designed to assess the program. Outlines several strategies designed to improve library resources and surveys. (VWC)

TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE
SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR 1999-2000

This summary report for Trident Technical College includes the following Institutional Effectiveness components: Majors or Concentrations, Academic Advising, Two-year to Four-year Transfer, and Library Resources and Services.

METHODOLOGY. The 1999-2000 Institutional Effectiveness (IE) activity marked the eighth year of Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS). The GAS, a flexible measurement process, is a systematic means of developing an individual yardstick for assessing the performance of individual programs and services. The GAS process allows individuals responsible for each program or service to identify performance indicators and levels of performance to measure the degree of each effectiveness indicator.

Since the first assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and the implementation of Trident's Quality Management process, the link between the two processes is best demonstrated by the Academic Advising assessment. Before Advising became a required element of Institutional Effectiveness, the Quality process identified Academic Advising as a process in need of improvement. The 1994-95 IE summary described the Academic Advising Process Improvement Team's status at the beginning. This year's summary describes the assessment of the first phase of full implementation of the new Advising process.

FUTURE REPORTS (1997-98). The following table presents the reporting dates for assessing Institutional Effectiveness Components from 2000 through 2003.

Institutional Effectiveness Components	2000	2001	2002	2003
General Education		X		X
Majors and Concentrations	X	X	X	X
Academic Advising	X		X	
2-year to 4-year Transfer	X		X	
Student Development		X		X
Library Resources	X		X	
Total Components	3	4	3	4

The following section presents a brief summary of each program and service assessed in 1999-2000.

GENERAL EDUCATION. This component will be assessed in 2001.

MAJORS AND CONCENTRATIONS. Twelve majors were identified for assessment during 1999-2000: Accounting; Computer Technology; General Business; Horticulture Technology; Hospitality and Tourism Management; Legal Assistant; Management; Nursing; Radio and Television Broadcasting; Radiologic Technology; Respiratory Care and Telecommunications Management.

Managers and faculty of each instructional program identified effectiveness indicators and expected levels of performance (benchmarks) for each program. Across the programs, the most common effectiveness indicators (used by 6 or more programs) include job placement rates, number of graduates, employer satisfaction, graduate satisfaction, student success in specified courses, student satisfaction with courses and instructors, and fall enrollment. Managers and faculty are also interested in the percent of graduates satisfied with their jobs, student success in specified courses, faculty availability scores, licensure exam pass rates and employers' satisfaction with graduates' technical skills. Some managers developed indicators

unique to instructional programs such as student to instructor ratios, student to equipment ratios, annual equipment budgets, fall to spring retention rates, percent of courses taught by full-time faculty, percent minority and female enrollment, percent of students who graduate within specific time periods, percent of all faculty meeting SACs requirements, and average class size.

In all cases assessment includes examination of whether or not specified benchmarks are met. All programs assessed met or exceeded the benchmarks specified for the majority of their performance indicators. The Legal Assistant program and the Horticulture program met or exceeded all benchmarks. Four programs failed to meet one indicator and six programs failed to meet two indicators. Those indicators for which benchmarks were not met are percent of graduates placed, number of graduates, employer satisfaction with graduates technical skills, student to instructor ratio, sections taught by full-time faculty, success rates in some courses, average faculty availability scores, licensure exam pass rates, fall enrollment, percent of minorities enrolled, and average class size.

Program managers designed improvement plans for those indicators where benchmarks were not met. The strategies are described by indicator.

Job Placement.

- Obtain permanent address from students before they graduate, to increase responses to Graduate Follow-Up Survey
- Reinforce the importance of the Graduate Follow-Up Survey to students in all class meetings in April and November, during the pinning practice in May and December and during all clinical groups in April and November.

Employer Satisfaction with Graduates' Technical Skills

- Develop and implement a plan to increase the number of employers responding to the Employer Follow-Up Survey in order to obtain more valid information regarding graduates' skills on the job.
- Faculty members will be assigned to contact every employer during the next Employer Follow-Up Survey.

Licensure Exam Pass Rates

- Administer Self-Assessment Examinations during the students' final semester of the program.
- Require students with unsatisfactory Self-Assessment scores to receive content remediation.
- Provide sample computerized examinations to introduce students to computerized adaptive testing.
- Require students to complete computerized clinical simulations throughout the program.

Course Success Rates.

- Develop sample exams to introduce assessment methodologies and to allow students to "self test" their existing competencies.
- Develop a peer tutoring system in which competent students mentor those with unsatisfactory performance.
- Refer students with unsatisfactory performance to Student Support Services.
- Require all new students to attend the College Orientation program.
- Licensure Exam Pass Rates

Fall Enrollment

- Offer at least one new course.
- Offer On-line versions of at least four additional courses.
- Develop one new degree track and two new certificate programs.
- Increase the number of Course in a Bag and Internet courses.
- Develop multiple methods of delivery for new career paths and certificate programs.

Percent of Minorities Enrolled

- Faculty members will make site visits to recruit students for the program.
- Offer tours of the campus facilities to representatives of industry and lock high school guidance counselors and career teachers.

- Develop and mail brochures to high school guidance counselor and career teachers informing of course availability, advisory committee projects, and volunteer work with schools.
- Develop Dual credit courses to be offered in local high schools.
- Faculty will be actively involved in the statewide industry association's activities and trade shows.

Percent of Full-time Faculty Teaching Courses/sections

- Continue to strive for more Full-time instructors and fewer adjuncts.

Average Faculty Availability Scores

- Ensure telephone number, e-mail address, building number, office number and office hours are prominently displayed on every course syllabus.
- Review the concept of "faculty availability" with each faculty member to ensure comprehension.
- Unobtrusively and systematically "spot check" to make certain faculty members keep office hours as stated in the course syllabus and on the door schedule.

ACADEMIC ADVISING. Early in 1995 the College's Quality Council identified Academic Advising as a process needing improvement. Since advisement was also a 1995 Institutional Effectiveness component, a Process Improvement Team (PIT) was organized. The Team's first assignment was to identify the Goal Attainment Scale effectiveness indicators and levels of performance expected of the advisement process.

Whereas the initial assessment of TTC's advising process identified much strength, one major weakness was uncovered. That is, from 17 to 38 percent of the students enrolled in key English, Math and Economic courses may have been without the prerequisite skills necessary to succeed. Without those prerequisite skills, students' chances for success in the course are reduced and complex pedagogical constraints are imposed upon the instructors.

In 1996-97, the PIT completed the data collection and analysis phase of their work. The team identified several elements of the advising process in need of improvement and presented recommendations to the Quality Council. Among the improvements implemented in 1996-97 is a computerized system that prevents students from registering for courses for which they lack prerequisites. In addition, the revised acceptance letters give students better information about the need for program advising.

Another weakness of the current advisement process was a lack of continuity. Students often saw several different advisors within the same program and expressed, in surveys, the sense that they "don't have an advisor." The Advising Process Improvement Team drafted a revision of the process to provide greater continuity of advisor and a consistent orientation to the advising process for all students. These process changes were implemented in 1998.

Spring 1999 brought full implementation of the Academic Advising process. Each campus has an Orientation Center available to new students on a walk in basis. Based upon a student's educational goals, the Orientation Center staff assigns an academic advisor. During an academic advising session the student receives academic advice and is registered for the courses selected. To maintain effective academic advising the college assigned an Advising Coordinator and an Advising Committee. The committee is responsible for collecting and disseminating advising information to all advisors and relevant staff, updating the Advisor Handbook annually, training new and current advisors and designing the GAScale for assessing the advising process.

The first assessment of the new Academic Advising process revealed some weaknesses. First, the percent of students who agree that faculty are available for advising purposes (85%) was much less than expected (90-93%). Then, the percent of enrolled students registered by their advisor for Fall 1999 (27%) was much less than expected (86%). It is encouraging to note that in Spring 2000 the percent of enrolled students registered by their advisor increased from 27 percent to 43 percent.

The Academic Advising committee developed the following plan to improve the academic advising process.

Improvement Plan

- Develop and implement a valid instrument to measure students' satisfaction with academic advising.
- Develop and implement a plan to randomly select a fixed percentage of each advisor's list of advisees and use telemarketers to contact these advisees.
- Determine the percentage of enrolled students registered by their advisors each term.
- Determine the frequency of advisor registering student during the registration period.
- Analyze students' course success rates to validate advising practices.
- Educate students as to what "availability" is.
- Make advisor's door schedules available on the Website.
- Publish more overtly in OnCourse (course schedule) the information about registration and advisor availability.
- Encourage faculty to make announcements to students about the registration period and advisor availability.
- Mail postcards to students stating their advisor's name, telephone number, and registration dates for each semester.

ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS TRANSFERRING FROM TWO- TO FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS.

Trident Technical College (TTC) gauges transfer activity and performance of students transferring from TTC to senior colleges by comparing: the size of transfer cohorts across time; the number and percent of students transferring to senior colleges; and each cohort's average GPA (for the fall term of transfer) with that of native students. The college also analyzes senior institutions' rejection rates for applicants from Trident Technical College.

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

Much of the 1999 data provided by the senior institutions are not comparable to 1996 or 1994 data. The 1996 report included MUSC data while the 1999 data excludes MUSC. Another major difference is the 1999 data identifies the number of incomplete applications, information not available in the past. The identification of incomplete applications allows rejection rate calculations based upon those students who completed the application process.

Cohort Size. The1996 MUSC data are eliminated from this analysis, thus transfer cohorts sizes are comparable from 1992 through 1999. Transfer cohorts are defined as those students who actually enroll in and complete the fall term. The Fall 1999 transfer cohort consists of 160 students, a 27 percent increase over the Fall 1996 cohort of 126 students. The following table presents Transfer Cohort size from 1992 to 1999.

TRANSFER COHORTS 1992 - 1999		
Cohort	***Size***	***Percent Difference***
Fall 1992	**133**	
Fall 1994	**123**	**-7.5%**
Fall 1996	**126**	**2.5%**
Fall 1999	**160**	**26.9%**

Receiving Institutions. It is important to recognize that the majority of the TTC Transfer students transfer to The Citadel and the College of Charleston. In fact 87 percent of the 1999 Transfer Cohort did so. The following table presents the receiving colleges and the number and percent of transfers from 1992 to 1999.

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TRANSFERS BY SENIOR INSTITUTION 1992 - 1999								
Receiving College	*1992*		*1994*		*1996*		*1999*	
	Transfers N=133	Percent Transfer	Transfers N=123	Percent Transfer	Transfers N=126	Percent Transfer	Transfers N=155	Percent Transfer
The Citadel	12	9%	15	12%	12	10%	21	14%
Clemson	6	5%	13	11%	8	6%	11	7%
Coastal Carolina	2	2%	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%
College of Charleston	84	63%	70	57%	89	71%	113	73%
Francis Marion	3	2%	6	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Lander	2	2%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%
South Carolina State	4	3%	4	3%	4	5%	6	4%
USC Columbia	17	13%	7	6%	4	5%	0	0%
USC Aiken	2	2%	6	5%	1	1%	0	0%
USC Spartanburg	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Winthrop	0	0%	0	0%	0	2.3%	0	0%

The above table indicates the majority of TTC's Transfer students continue to select The Citadel and the College of Charleston, 72 percent in 1992, 69 percent in 1994, 81 percent in 1996, and 87 percent in 1999.

Fall Term GPAs. The comparison of the 1999 TTC Transfer Cohort's GPAs with native students' GPAs from each senior college requires a different analysis than in the past. In previous years the data received from the senior colleges allowed analysis of each student's performance. The 1999 data provides an average GPA for those students who transferred and completed 0 to 29 hours, 30 to 59 hours, or 60 or more hours. Analysis of individual student performance is not possible. For instance The Citadel reported three white males as having transferred or completed 0 to 29 hours. Their average GPA is 1.56. There is no way to determine whether or not one or more of the three performed as well as the 323 native students whose average GPA is 2.22. In fact, the 1999 transfer data limits analysis.

The available data does allow a comparison of average GPAs across the three categories of credit hours transferred and earned. The following table presents Trident Transfer Students' average GPAs compared to each Senior college's native students' average GPAs.

Senior College	**Trident Technical College Transfer Students' Fall 1999 Average GPA**		**Senior Institution First Time Native Students' Fall 1999 Average GPA**		**Difference in GPA Senior Native minus Trident Transfer**
	Students	***AVG. GPA***	***Students***	***AVG. GPA***	
The Citadel	21	2.57	1588	2.65	.08
Clemson	11	2.38	12695	2.73	.35
College of Charleston	113	2.73	5286	2.79	.06
Coastal Carolina	2	1.41	266	2.76	1.35
Lander	2	3.83	1077	2.48	(1.35)
South Carolina State	6	2.22	2886	2.42	.20
Total	155	2.66	23798	2.69	.03

Across all senior colleges TTC Transfer students performed at essentially the same level as native students. TTC Transfer students earned an average GPA of 2.66 as compared to senior institutions native students' average of 2.69.
This table above indicates TTC students transferring toThe Citadel, Clemson, College of Charleston, Lander and South Carolina State established an average GPA above 2.00. In the two cases where large differences occur, Coastal Carolina and Lander, only two students transferred. Conclusions cannot be drawn from a sample of two.

Rejection Rates. The methodology applied to this report counts only those TTC Applicants and Technical System Applicants who completed applications to the senior colleges. The following table presents a comparison of the senior college rejection rates for TTC applicants and the Technical System applicants.

Senior College Receiving Applications	**Trident Applicants / Rejection Rates 1999**		**Technical System Appliants / Rejection Rates 1999**		**Percent Difference Trident – Technical System 1999**
	Student Apps	*Percent Reject*	*Student Apps*	*Percent Reject*	*Trident 1999 Minus Tech. Sys. 1999*
The Citadel	27	11%	49	25%	14% lower
Clemson	25	40%	387	26%	14% higher
College of Charleston	172	32%	295	27%	5 higher
Coastal Carolina	3	0	212	8%	8% lower
Francis Marion	3	67%	110	20%	47% higher
Lander	0	0%	219	0%	
South Carolina State	6	0%	134	9%	9% lower
USC Aiken	1	0%	170	19%	19% lower
USC Columbia	66	32%	1087	27%	5% higher
USC Spartanburg	4	25%	425	4%	21% higher
Winthrop	10	10%	199	6%	4% higher
Total	317	29%	3231	19%	10% higher

Of the senior colleges The Citadel is the most accepting of TTC applicants. The Citadel rejected only 11 percent of TTC applicants while 25 percent of the Technical System applicants were rejected. On the other hand Clemson rejected 40 percent of TTC applicants compared to 26 percent of the Technical System applicants. The College of Charleston and USC Columbia rejected 32 percent of TTC applicants compared to 27 percent of the Technical System applicants.

Unfortunately, the lack of detail in transfer data limits further analysis. The results of this analysis offer little or no direction for designing improvement strategies.

LIBRARY RESOURCES.

The primary function of Trident Technical College's Learning Resources is to provide resources and services at the point of need based on the mission of the college, the nature and needs of the students, the curriculum and instructional programs. The secondary function of the support service is, through a qualified, dedicated, and informed staff, to provide resources and services relevant to the general informational needs, the intellectual and professional growth, the cultural development and the recreational activities of the total college population.

The outcomes of the 1999-2000 Learning Resource assessment met or exceeded expected levels of performance for 15 of 21 indicators designed to assess the program. Areas assessed were Collection, Access, Education, Outreach, organizational Capability, and Staffing. Outcomes falling below expectations are related to collection size, faculty satisfaction with resources for assignments, students' desire for more library instruction, student and graduate satisfaction with Learning Resources, and staffing on all three campuses.

Unit Strengths

Positive results on qualitative measures such as the Graduate Student Follow-up Survey, Faculty SACS survey, Fall 1999 Student Survey indicate that a majority of patrons find the LRC resources and services to be satisfactory. The satisfaction rate on the Graduate Student Follow-up Survey reached 85%, a 20% increase over five years.

The LRC provides strong support for learners on and off campus with resources and services available through the TRION (Trident Resources for Information Online) gateway website. The number of electronic resources available has increased dramatically since the 1998 report. Results of LRC outreach, a strategic goal, show increases in use statistics since the last report. The LRC has a strong Education program with growth in classes from 22% over base to 56% over base. The LRC provides a modular approach to Education and Information Literacy with Basic Resources Classes, Advanced, Self-guided Tours, Online Tutorials, and special workshops. LRC staff made a systematic effort to collect baseline data related to LRC operations during Fall 1999. A broad-based survey was administered to students during this semester to obtain qualitative and quantitative data. The Library and Information Resources Advisory Committee was formed in Spring, 2000. Members on this college standing committee represent all divisions in the college.

Unit Weaknesses

Although the LRC offers a variety of Education Services, there are many students and faculty unaware of these offerings. There is a need to increase the number of courses that have an information assignment; workshops for faculty, staff and students; and the opportunities for students to have library experiences. A recent retention workshop offered specific suggestions on ways to increase faculty and student awareness and to promote closer articulation between faculty and the LRC related to assignments. The Library and Information Resources Advisory Committee addresses these weaknesses. A broad faculty survey is planned for Fall, 2000. The results will be used to design improvement strategies.

A number of electronic resources help to provide a broader collection, but the LRC still needs ongoing and significant acquisition of books to adequately support TTC's instructional programs. The budget for materials per FTE student is not increasing as expected.

The LRC needs to increase circulation of AV materials by students.

The LRC continues to be inadequately staffed with professionals at Berkeley Campus.

Improvement strategies

Several strategies are designed to improve library resources and surveys. Those strategies are briefly described below.

Increase faculty/staff/student awareness of resources and services.

- Administer comprehensive faculty/staff survey to obtain qualitative and quantitative baseline data; develop additional promotional materials; offer drop-in workshops on a regular basis; develop an online course; add

additional Education/Reference staff.

Continue to increase the number of courses with an information assignment or required library visit.

- Advocate with Department Heads, Academic Deans, VP for Academic Affairs

Continue to increase alignment between information assignments, resources, and education services.

- Develop sample assignments; work with Department Heads, Academic Deans, VP for Academic Affairs.

Increase print collection.

- The LRC needs to make several large purchases of materials for the core collection. The TTC print collection is below 80,000 volumes. ACRL standards recommend 80,000 volumes as a minimum for one campus - TTC is a three-campus system.

Increase student use of AV materials including VIS.

- Develop audio-visual area, use of VIS and other AV materials.

Provide more librarian assistance at Berkeley Campus LRC.

A librarian provides Librarian/reference services one day per week. At other times reference services are offered by tele-video. Increased enrollment will soon require weekend and later evening hours, plus more on-site reference assistance. Additional staff is necessary if these needs are to be met.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").